



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/518,597	12/21/2004	Gerard Laslaz	22131-00015-US	2632
30678	7590	11/26/2007	EXAMINER	
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP			MORILLO, JANELL COMBS	
1875 EYE STREET, N.W.				
SUITE 1100			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20036			1793	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/26/2007		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/518,597	LASLAZ ET AL.
	Examiner Janelle Combs-Morillo	Art Unit 1793

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 October 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2,4-13 and 15-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2,4-13 and 15-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-2, 4-13, 15-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over SU 348633A (SU'633).

SU'633 teaches an aluminum casting part with good strength properties (abstract) formed from aluminum alloy with 6-8% Si, 0.5-0.9% Mg, 0.3-0.7% Cu, 0.05-0.2% Zr, 0.1-0.2% Ti, 0.1-0.2% Mn, which overlaps or touches the boundary of the presently claimed ranges of Si, Mg, Cu, Ti, Zr, Fe, Mn, Zn, and Ni of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-11, 15-19, 21). Because SU'633 teaches an overlapping alloy composition, it is held that SU'633 has created a *prima facie* case of obviousness of the presently claimed invention.

Overlapping ranges have been held to be a *prima facie* case of obviousness, see MPEP § 2144.05. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select any portion of the range, including the claimed range, from the broader range disclosed in the prior art, because the prior art finds that said composition in the entire disclosed range has a suitable utility.

Additionally, "The normal desire of scientists or artisans to improve upon what is already generally known provides the motivation to determine where in a disclosed set of percentage ranges is the optimum combination of percentages," In re Peterson, 65 USPQ2d at 1379 (CAFC 2003).

Concerning the equation in claims 6 and 20, SU'633 teaches ranges of Mg and Cu that meet said limitation.

Concerning product by process claim 12, SU'633 does not mention (in the translated parts) the heat treatment temper applied to said Al-Si alloy. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply a peak strength T6 type temper to the alloy taught by SU'633 because said alloy is used for high strength manufacturing parts such as a diesel engine (abstract).

Concerning product claim 13, because SU'633 teaches said alloy is used for high strength heavy duty machinery body castings, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to cast the alloy taught by SU'633 into a cylinder head or crankcase, substantially as presently claimed.

3. Claims 1-2, 4-13, 15-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dulin (US 2,821,495A).

Dulin teaches an aluminum casting part with good strength properties (column 1 lines 14-17) formed from aluminum alloy with 5-10% Si, 0.25-0.6% Mg, 0.1-1.5% Cu, 0.01-1% of one or more of Zr, Ti, and Mn (column 2 lines 31-40), which overlaps or touches the boundary of the presently claimed ranges of Si, Mg, Cu, Ti, Zr, Fe, Mn, Zn, and Ni of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-11, 15-19, 21). Because Dulin teaches an overlapping alloy composition, it is held that Dulin has created a prima facie case of obviousness of the presently claimed invention.

Overlapping ranges have been held to be a prima facie case of obviousness, see MPEP § 2144.05.

Concerning the equation in claims 6 and 20, Dulin teaches ranges of Mg and Cu that meet said limitation.

Concerning product by process claim 12, Dulin teaches a solution heating, quenching, and artificially aging heat treatment temper applied to said Al-Si alloy (column 2 lines 41-63), which qualifies as a peak strength T6 type temper.

Concerning product claim 13, because Dulin teaches said alloy is used for high strength structural component castings (column 4 lines 16-17), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to cast the alloy taught by Dulin into a cylinder head or crankcase, substantially as presently claimed.

#### *Response to Arguments*

4. In the response filed on October 5, 2007, applicant amended claim 1, and added new claim 21. The examiner agrees that no new matter has been added.

5. The instant amendment has overcome the rejections in view of JP'244, the examiner agrees that JP'244 does not teach or suggest a Al-Si alloy complete with the instant Fe maximum. Dulin or SU'633 are considered to be the closest prior art.

6. Applicant's argument that the present invention is allowable over the prior art of record because the prior art teaches broadly overlapping ranges, and there is no motivation to select the instant ranges from that taught by the prior art, or that the instant invention has significantly improved creep resistance with respect to the prior art has not been found persuasive for reasons a), b), c) set forth below.

Concerning reason a), overlapping ranges have been held to be a *prima facie* case of obviousness, see MPEP § 2144.05. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select any portion of the range, including the claimed range, from the broader range disclosed in the prior art, because the prior art finds that said composition in the entire disclosed range has a suitable utility. Additionally, "The normal desire of scientists or artisans to improve upon what is already generally known provides the motivation to determine where in a disclosed set of percentage ranges is the optimum combination of percentages," *In re Peterson*, 65 USPQ2d at 1379 (CAFC 2003).

Concerning reason b), once a reference teaching product appearing to be substantially identical is made the basis of a rejection, and the examiner presents evidence or reasoning tending to show inherency, the burden shifts to the applicant to show an unobvious difference. "[T]he PTO can require an applicant to prove that the prior art products do not necessarily or inherently possess the characteristics of his [or her] claimed product. Whether the rejection is based on inherency' under 35 U.S.C. 102, on *prima facie* obviousness' under 35 U.S.C. 103, jointly or alternatively, the burden of proof is the same, and its fairness is evidenced by the PTO's inability to manufacture products or to obtain and compare prior art products." *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433-34 (CCPA 1977)), see MPEP 2112. Applicant has not clearly shown an unobvious difference between the instant invention and the prior art's product.

7. Concerning reason c), applicant has not clearly shown specific unexpected results with respect to the prior art of record or criticality of the instant claimed range (wherein said results must be fully commensurate in scope with the instantly claimed ranges, etc. see MPEP 716.02 d). To establish unexpected results over a claimed range, applicants should compare a sufficient

number of tests both inside and outside the claimed range to show the criticality of the claimed range. *In re Hill*, 284 F.2d 955, 128 USPQ 197 (CCPA 1960).

8. As previously stated, the declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 filed 4/27/2007 (along with the arguments filed 4/6/2007) was sufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 1-20 based upon FR'927. The examiner agrees that FR'927 teaches a range of V outside the instant claims. However, said declaration does not show unexpected results with respect to the newly applied art of JP'244, Dulin, or SU'633. Additionally, it is unclear that the entire claimed alloying ranges are expected to behave in a manner consistent with the tested examples.

9. Applicant's argument that the present invention is allowable over the prior art of record because the amounts of B, Be, and misch metal taught by SU'633 are excluded by the instant claim has not been found persuasive. The amounts of B, Be, and misch metal taught by SU'633 fall within (or with respect to V, 0.1% is held to be a close approximation of) <0.1% each and <0.30% total. The examiner notes and agrees that SU'633 appears to teach a minimum amount of V of 0.1%.

10. Applicant's argument that the present invention is allowable over the prior art of record because the prior art is drawn to a different type of product from the instant Al-Si casting alloy has not been found persuasive. The motivation to cast the Al-Si alloy into a cylinder heat or crankcase (instant claim 13) is set forth above.

11. Applicant's argument that the present invention is allowable over the prior art of record because there is no motivation to select Zr from the markush group taught by the prior art has not been found persuasive, because it is *prima facie* obvious to substitute equivalents known for the same purpose, see MPEP 2144.06. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

to select Zr from the markush group taught by Dulin, because Dulin teaches Zr is a suitable element to provide the predictable result of grain refining and hardening.

*Conclusion*

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Janelle Combs-Morillo whose telephone number is (571) 272-1240. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am- 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (571) 272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:  
10/518,597  
Art Unit: 1793

Page 8

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

  
JCM  
November 19, 2007

  
ROY KING  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700